THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Student/

School District/ IDPH-E-FY-19-12-017

School District

DUE PROCESS DECISION

I. INTRODUCTION

On December 18, 2018, the School District filed an expedited due process request seeking an order approving a proposed 45-day Interim Alternative Educational Setting (IAES).

The issues for hearing are as follows:

- Whether the December 7, 2018 determination that Student's continued attendance at
 High School poses a substantial risk of injury to another Student,
 Doe, ² warranting an IAES for
 45 school days, pursuant to 34 C.F.R.§ 300.532(b)(2)(ii);
- 2. Whether the IEP team's proposed placement tutoring, related services and recreational services, with tutoring and other programming located at the SAU office, pending admission to another high school is appropriate under 34 C.F.R. § 300.532(b)(2)(ii).

The prehearing conference was held on January 11, 2019, in conjunction with companion case IDPH-FY-19-12-016. The due process hearing took place on the following days: January 18, 22, 23, 24 and 25. 3 essent each day were: Parents; Parents' counsel Attorneys and should be special Education Coordinator and should be submitted voluminous exhibits, including a video of an Post-hearing submissions were filed.

The following witnesses provided testimony relative to the above issues: 4

- 1. Doe's 2. , accompanied by counsel for the family of Doe's 3. High School special education teacher in the program, which Student and Doe attended: 4. Ph.D., psychologist who evaluated and made recommendations regarding 5. Dr. Doe: , neuropsychologist who reviewed records relative to Doe and Student; 6. Dr.
- 6. Dr. , forensic psychologist, who evaluated Student;7. Dr. ineuropsychologist who evaluated Student;

Doe's parents have authorized the use of records in this hearing, subject to certain protective provisions set forth in the protective order. This Decision is subject to the protective order.

The hearing in this expedited matter was originally scheduled for January 18 and 21, 2019; scheduling certain witnesses during the wing three days was necessary due to witness availability and to insure full and fair presentation of evidence.

Although the two cases involve common issues of fact and law, they are not consolidated. However, both cases have a consolidated

School District school psychologist; , Board Certified Behavior Analyst (BCBA), who conducted a Functional 9. Behavioral Assessment (FBA) on Student; 10. School District Director of 11. School District Special Education Coordinator; 12. , SAU Special Education Director; 13. Student's mother; 14. Student's father. II. **FACTS** 1. Student is a ·year-old high school ' who has resided in the of , New Hampshire with Parents and all of life. Student is well-liked, and participates in many sports and other community activities, including basketball and bowling. Student is diagnosed with lisability, a delay, and a delay. qualifies for special education under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). 2. School District is responsible for the provision of an education to the residents of the 3. The Town of School District does not have a public high school and thus has The entered into a long-term contract known as an Authorized Regional Area Enrollment Agreement (AREA Agreement) with the School Department to provide a high school education to its residents at High School (). 4. is also responsible for transporting students to and from and contracts with for that purpose. 5. Until April 29, 2018, Student received instruction in the , taught by special . Eight to nine other students, including educator Doe, accessed classroom at 6. Student's 2017-2018 IEP called for two (2) eighty-one (81) minute sessions per day of life skills program consisted of instruction in all academic areas, speech therapy, occupational therapy, and adaptive physical education. Student also attended two (2) regular education classes per day. Student's IEP calls for supervision in the building at all times, to ensure is behaving appropriately and safely. 7. Doe is a entitled to special education and related services under the IDEA by I 8. Doe receives programming in classroom for also accesses per day. 's classroom for support throughout ' day.

8. Dr.

9.	On the morning of had the day before.	·	, 2017,	reported that	Doe told	that Student

- 10 In late December 2017, a Title IX investigation was conducted by
 2018 report, made several recommendation, including: Student's current program should be reviewed to discuss additional behavioral supports or consultations that might be needed; the two students should be seated separately on the school bus at all times and that all bus drivers, including substitutes, be informed of this necessary separation; the two students should not have unsupervised time together in the school environment; both students "receive some direct instruction in
- 11. 's Title IX Summary Report concluded that, "considering all factors, the incident does not meet the definition of per Policy JBAA. However, the interaction constituted "an inappropriate exchange that warrants follow-up."
- 12. Student's IEP Team met on February 22, 2018; at that meeting, and at subsequent meetings throughout the remainder of the 2017-2018 school year, the team and proposed a consult and a signal.
- 13. The purposes of the FBA included addressing Student's inappropriate behaviors and informing inform the team as to how best to provide direct to Student.
- 14. Ultimately, in July of 2018, the Parents provided consent for the FBA. The FBA was conducted by , BCBA.
- 15. On April 13, 2018, a complaint was received from day. The initial complaint was that Doe's Saw Student and Doe
 - 16. A request of for all relevant incident which had occurred on there was no video available for video footage for 2018, during to 2018.
 - 17. Immediate steps were taken to see that, from that day forward, Student and Student and Steps were also taken to see that the Students were separated in the school.
 - 18. Expert witnesses and others who viewed the , 2018 video testified that they saw

20. On April 30, 2018 a disciplinary referral was made, and Student was suspended for

19.

five (5) school days.

21	5	Upon completion of Student's suspension, hired a tutor who was certified as a special education teacher to provide tutoring and life skills programming, overseen by For the remainder of the 2017-2018 school year, the tutoring took place in the at .			
22	f	The was not isolated, and Student also continued to attend classes for the balance of the school year The presented opportunities for interaction with other students, including students (other than Doe) who frequented classroom.			
23	1	A second Title IX investigation was assigned to Associate Principal . On 2018, Principal issued a Title IX Investigation Summary Report. That report found, among other hings, that Student's			
		be separated from .			
24	ļ. <i>'</i>	The May 8, 2018 Title IX Report contained a number of directives and recommendations, including:			
		 a. The two students should never be transported in the same vehicle, and bus personnel should be made aware of this requirement and be trained in safety protocols; 			
		b. In the school environment, the Students must be kept separated and not have contact with each other during the school day or extra-curricular activities;			
		c. Student's team should meet to review the current plan, including necessary behavioral supports to address inappropriate behaviors;			
d. The Student's team should employ outside behavioral consultation for evaluation and to develop a comprehensive behavior plan;					
		e.			
		f.			
25. The school districts met with Student's Parents on May 9, 2018 to review the outcome of the Title IX investigation.					
26.	St	udent's Parents did not appeal the determinations from the Title IX report.			
		May 2018, the Parents contacted Dr. to complete a risk assessment of Student. As part of sessment, Dr. viewed the , 2018 video. did not meet with or assess Doe.			
	kn un wi ind	noted, among other things, that developmentally, Student presents as a very young child, has no owledge of anatomy or the mechanics of sexual activity, and has deficits in derstanding of relationships; Dr. opined that Student's actions are consistent with past problems th impulsivitythat have been noted in academic records. Dr. concluded that there was no dication of anything predatory about Student's behavior, and problems in the area of boundary thing can be easily managed with routine precautions.			

	 (a) (b) A behavioral support program designed to help Student develop better social skills and understanding of interpersonal boundaries; and (c) Close supervision throughout the school day, especially during unstructured times. 					
	Dr. opined t	hat recommend	ations could be carri	ied out at		
30	In August of 2018, from 2018 video and	the Parents obtaine Ce incident reports, ar	nter. As part of	evaluation, Dr.	of Student from Dr. reviewed the and teachers.	
31	impairments, poor negatively impact	reasoning, impulse of ability to process ions), and utilize ap education in a p	control challenges, a s social cues, demon propriate behaviors	and social proce strate appropria in specific situa	itive deficits, langua ssing weaknesses we te social judgment (ations. Dr. opi e supports as well as	ould likely especially in ned that
32	On August 22, 2018 Student's IEP to be maintains separatio	8, the IEP Team me implemented at n between the two s	pending completi	e alternative sch	edules that would al but which would co	low entinue to
33	. 44					
	2 · *	- 10 - 10		\$119		
34	. Oı. , 20	018, Dr.	authored a cli	nical consultatio	on opinion regarding	Doe.
35.	5. Dr. opined, among other things, that:					
	1 (20)			•	± 1000 to	
	힘					
36.	Both an 's school, 2018	l psychologist, also	neir school psycholo met with Dr.	ogists review Dr and Doe	100000 ±	_
37.	. Dr. i disabilities who hav				working with childr eria for the diagnosis	
38.	Although there were foundation, the school	e elements of Dr. ool districts did take	's opinion pe		ent that lacked clinic pinions pertaining to	
39.)	also had of but concec		t reviewed by Dr.	. Dr	questioned th	e diagnosis

recommended the following services to be provided to Student:

29. Dr.

- 40. On ^ '. 2018, , Principal, determined that Student presented a substantial and serious risk of causing injury to Doe if remained at . Dr. 'memorandum, which was shared with the IEP team, stated that
- 41. After 2018, Dr. conducted a comprehensive evaluation of Doe and issued a is well-qualified in the evaluation of children with has provided consultation to both parents and school districts.
- 42. In Dr. 's professional opinion, re-exposure to Student would present a substantial mental health risk to Do
- 43. The School District determined an appropriate IAES for Student and also proposed that be placed in another public high school.
- 44. On October 10, 2018 the parties entered into a mediated settlement agreement. Student remained in the IAES pending the outcome of the settlement agreement, and remained in the IEAS after the mediated agreement became null and void in early December of 2018.
- 45. On December 7, 2018, the School District, though its counsel, issued a second determination that Student presented a substantial risk to Doe.
- 46. On December 14, 2018, the IEP team proposed an IAES, consisting of the following: 10 hours per week of tutoring by a Special Education, with added; one 45-minute session of one-to-one Speeck/Language therapy per week; one 45-minute session of Occupational Therapy per week; behavioral consultation by a BCBA; two hours per week of community access as recreational therapy per week provided by in lieu of adaptive physical education. Tutoring and other services would be based at the SAU office until an appropriate school accepted Student, and then Student would be placed at that school.
- 47. At the time of the December 14, 2018 team meeting, the IEP team had explored various options for placement at public and private high schools. High School had indicated a willingness to consider Student for admission, subject to its policy of only accepting non-resident students via a "manifest educational hardship" placement.
- 48. School Board has indicated that, if Parents applied for placement to based on manifest educational hardship, it would approve that request without requiring an additional hearing.

 Once this occurs, would convene its IEP team to make a final decision regarding Student's admission.
- 49. The School District offered to cover Parents' legal costs incurred in preparing a manifest educational hardship request to the School Board. also proposed that Parents could make a manifest educational hardship request without prejudice to their position that Student should return to ...
- 50. High School provides transition programming to age 21. Although does not have Unified Sports at present, it does have other activities, such as clubs, which provide integration into the school community.

 Although does not after school events, and also has a Life Skills program.

- 51. In November of 2018, Student visited activity with disabled and non-disabled peers. had made friends there.

 High School and participated in an after-school told staff that liked and
- 52. No evidence was proffered that Student failed to make meaningful educational progress on objectives during the three weeks that was separated from Doe at , or in any other setting.
 - 53. The separation of the two students at was not, and is not, a viable plan for either student in that it deprives them of access to portions of the high school and is not a realistic placement option.
 - 54. If Student attends it is virtually impossible to guarantee that the two students would never encounter one another.
 - 55. Student can access education in a public school setting with appropriate supports. An inclusive school setting for Student is recommended as the least restrictive school environment.
 - 56. According to school staff.
 - 57. Dr. reviewed educational records relative to both Student and Doe. did not examine or meet either student or their parents, or speak with teachers. Dr. opined that the students could remain at together following a therapeutic reintegration plan, which believes can occur over the course of four (4) to eight (8) weeks.
- .57. Although the experts testified as to other possible factors, such as

 , and although there are conflicting accounts as to some of the reported incidents, there is sufficient evidence proffered by experts and others that Student's presence at poses a risk to Doe at this time.
 - 58. If Student is closely supervised by skilled paraprofessionals, and receives behavioral interventions pursuant to a behavior plan written and supervised by a BCBA, he does not pose a risk to any student other than Doe and can be educated in a regular public high school.

III. RULINGS OF LAW

- 59 The School District bears the burden of proof and persuasion. Schaffer v. Weast, 546 U.S. 49 (2005). The burden in this case requires the district to proffer evidence that maintaining Student's current placement at is substantially likely to result in injury to Doe. 34 CFR 300.532 (a), and that the proposed IAES is appropriate.
- 60. A hearing officer has the authority under 20 USC 1415(k)(3(B)(ii)(II) to order a change in placement of a child with a disability to an appropriate interim alternative educational setting for not more than 45 school days if the hearing officer determines that maintaining the current placement of such child is substantially likely to result in injury to the child or to others.
- 61. Hearing officers have the authority under 34 C.F.R. § 300.532 to exercise their judgment after considering all factors and the body of evidence presented in an individual case when determining whether a child's behavior is substantially likely to result in injury to the child or

others.

- 62. In view of the Title IX findings, it was appropriate and reasonable for _____ to take steps to protect _____ Doe from further harm. See <u>Davis v. Monroe Cnty. Bd. Of Educ.</u>, 526 U.S. 629, 646-647 (1999); see also <u>Thomas v. Springfield Sch. Committee</u>, 59 F.Supp.3d 294, (D. Mass. 2014).
- 63. There was no appeal from the May 8, 2018 Title IX determinations. This forum lacks authority for an appeal or a collateral challenge to the Title IX findings.
- 64. Students with disabilities may, under appropriate circumstances and in accordance with proper procedures, be removed from a placement due to Title IX violations.
- 65. The IAES proposed by the street of the latest proposed by the street of the latest proposed by the street of the street of the latest proposed in the December 14, 2018 written prior notice, will enable Student to participate in the general education curriculum and progress toward meeting IEP goals.

IV. PARTIES' REQUESTS FOR FINDINGS OF FACT AND RULINGS OF LAW

I have carefully read and considered the parties' legal arguments, as well as each of the proposed findings of fact and rulings of law. However, many of the proposed findings and rulings either cannot be granted or denied as written, or pertain primarily to the companion case, or both.

Accordingly, a number of the parties' proposed findings and rulings have instead been incorporated into this Decision. To the extent that a proposed finding of fact or ruling of law conflicts with those set forth herein, it is deemed denied.

V. CONCLUSION AND ORDER

This case presents a unique set of circumstances. Student can be educated in a regular public high school, with certain services in place. could remain at , but for the presence of one other student. This case does not turn on any "intent" on Student's part, nor does the potential harm to Doe depend on whether Student engages in inappropriate behavior toward .

The impact on Doe is not the only consideration when evaluating the appropriateness of the proposed IAES. Given the history of this case, there is some question as to whether placement at might negatively impact *Student* as well. For example, possible repercussions from even a chance encounter between Student and Doe could potentially jeopardize Student's ability to receive a FAPE at .

There is nothing to prevent the IEP teams from developing a carefully crafted therapeutic re-integration plan as suggested by Dr. . A transition period for Student's re-entry into is required to ensure sufficient supports are in place to protect the health and safety of both students. However, such a plan would have to include and be endorsed by Doe and parents, something that this forum cannot order. There is sufficient evidence on this record to conclude that, absent such a plan, the proposed IAES, which includes identification of an alternative public high school placement such as , is necessary to avoid further harm while providing Student with a FAPE.

Accordingly, it is ordered:

A.		, 2018 determination that Student's continued attendance at			
	of injury to	Doe, warranting an IAES for 45 school days, pursuant to 34	C.F.R.§ 300.532(b)(2)(ii),		
	is supported by the evidence;				

B. The IEP team's proposed IAES, as described in the December 14, 2018 Written Prior Notice, is appropriate under 34 C.F.R. § 300.532(b)(2)(ii).

Date: February 1, 2019

Amy B. Davidson, Hearing Officer

APPEAL RIGHTS

If either party is aggrieved by the decision of the hearing officer as stated above, either party may appeal this decision to a court of competent jurisdiction. The Parents have the right to obtain a transcription of the proceedings from the Department of Education. The School District shall promptly notify the Commissioner of Education if either party, Parents or School District, seeks judicial review of the hearing officer's decision

Cc:

Via electronic transmission

nd certified mail, return receipt requested